

REMARKS

Within the Office Action dated 24 September 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 9-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C section 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 7,089,321 B2 to Hayashi (Hayashi) in view of United States Patent Application 2004/0,268,407 to Sparrell (Sparrell).

Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2007/0,199,030 to Ellis et al. (Ellis).

Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2004/0,221,302 to Ansari (Ansari).

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2006/0179462 to Willame (Willame).

Claim 21 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and “Automatic Windows 98/ME TCP/IP Addressing Without a DHCP Server” (APIPA).

By this response Applicants amend claims 1, 9 and 17, but do not add or cancel any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-21 will be pending in the application upon entry of this amendment.

Advisory Action and Interview

The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on 10 December 2008, and granted an interview on 21 January 2009, in which the Sparrell reference, and particularly paragraph 00777

was discussed. In view of the discussion, Applicants amend the claims to further clarify the distinctions between the cited references and the claims.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-8

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell. Claim 3 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ellis. Claim 4 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ansari. Claims 5-8 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Willame. Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for networking several clients in a personal video recording (“PVR”) system. The method receives several television signals and tunes each of the television signals in one of several tuners. The method buffers the television signals on a storage medium in at least one PVR media server. The method couples several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The method receives at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and allocates resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The method designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The designating of the states is advantageously used by the PVR system for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. To further clarify the distinctions, Applicants amend the claims to recite that the designating of the states is advantageously used by the system for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 1. Since claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 2-8 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8.

II. Rejection of Claims 9-16

Claims 9-10 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell. Claim 11 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ellis. Claim 12 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Ansari. Claims 13-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Willame. Claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9.

Claim 9 recites a personal video recording (“PVR”) media server comprising an input for receiving several television signals, several tuners, a storage medium, and a network interface. The tuners are for tuning each of the television signals, and the storage medium is for buffering the television signals. The network interface is for coupling several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is for receiving at least one request from each of

at least two clients for at least one service of a PVR system, and for allocating resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The server designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The designating of the states is used for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a server. To further clarify the distinctions, Applicants amend the claims to recite that the designating of the states is advantageously used for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 9. Since claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 10-16 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 9. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-16.

III. Rejection of Claims 17-21

Claims 17-20 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell. Claim 21 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and APIPA. Claims 18-21 are dependent on Claim 17.

Claim 17 recites a personal video recording (“PVR”) system comprising at least one PVR media server, a network, and several clients. The PVR media server has an input for receiving

several television signals, several tuners for tuning each of the television signals, and a storage medium for buffering the television signals. The clients are coupled over the network to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is configured for receiving at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and for allocating resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The system designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The designating of the states is used for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a system. To further clarify the distinctions, Applicants amend the claims to recite that the designating of the states is advantageously used for resolving conflicts in allocating tuners to the requesting clients.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 17. Since claims 18-21 are dependent on claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not invalidate these claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 17. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-21.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the claims, namely claims 1-21, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

MACROVISION SOLUTIONS CORP.

Dated: January 21, 2009

/Andy Pho/

Andy T. Pho
Reg. No. 48,862

MACROVISION SOLUTIONS CORP.
2830 De La Cruz Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Phone: (408) 562 8496
Fax: (408) 567 1800